

SURVEY ON REDEVELOPMENT FUNDS – JANUARY 2005

| Jurisdiction | Does your jurisdiction have uncommitted redevelopment funds? | If so, would your jurisdiction be potentially interested in contributing funds to another jurisdiction for the construction of low- and moderate-income housing, provided that your agency received some credit toward your housing element for the construction of this housing? | Would your jurisdiction be potentially interested in contributing funds to another jurisdiction for the construction of low- and moderate-income housing, even if your jurisdiction does not receive credit toward your housing element for the construction of this housing? | Does your jurisdiction have a housing element certified by the California Department of Housing and Community Development? | Has your jurisdiction met 40 percent of its very low and low-income housing needs? | What changes in current funding options, programs or law would you recommend be pursued to provide an incentive to develop affordable housing? |
|--------------|--|---|---|--|--|---|
| Burlingame | No | Not applicable | No | Yes | No | We would urge legislation that would allow smaller cities that don't have RDA money or their own share of CDBG funds to combine with other cities and to get credit for whatever they can create through those partnerships regardless of the jurisdiction that the housing is eventually created in. We understand that more "credit" may need to be given to the city that actually ends up hosting the affordable property, but a city like Burlingame with expensive land values and no funding, some credit is better than none. |
| Pacifica | No | -- | No | No | No | |
| San Carlos | Yes | Yes | No | Yes | No | |

| | | | | | | |
|----------------|---|---|-------------------------|-----|------------------------------------|--|
| Brisbane | No | We will have housing funds in future. It might make sense to work on a cooperative funding project. | Maybe, but less likely. | Yes | No. Work in progress. | |
| Woodside | Woodside has no redevelopment areas or funds. | -- | -- | Yes | -- | |
| Daly City | No housing set aside funds currently available. | Yes | No | Yes | No | Rescind all Sate law regarding housing! |
| Portola Valley | No | Yes. We have other funds for BMR's. | No | Yes | -- | |
| Redwood City | No | No. Our need too great. | No | Yes | Yes under Redevelopment Area No. 2 | Additional flexibility related to (1) HUD noise standards for projects on transportation corridor, (2) relocation, (3) costs. Also, State must stop raids on City and Redevelopment funds. |
| San Bruno | Not now. The San Bruno RDA is relatively young and has not accumulated incremental funds. | Not now. Possibly in the future. | No | Yes | Yes | |

| | | | | | | |
|--------------|---|--|--------------|--|----------------|--|
| Menlo Park | No | Maybe | No | No | Yes | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • funding assistance per unit is too low in high cost markets like Menlo Park' • few funding sources targeted to ownership housing |
| Foster City | Yes | No | No | Yes | Yes | |
| Belmont | Yes | Possibly | Probably not | Yes | By end of 2005 | |
| Atherton | Atherton has no redevelopment areas or funds. | -- | -- | -- | -- | |
| Millbrae | No | We will expend all our housing funds in Station Area BMR assistance in Millbrae. | No | Not yet – State HCD still in review process. | Yes | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 55 year affordability requirement in H & S Code is unrealistic • Agencies should be allowed to collaborate and pool funds for projects and administration if they desire • Housing Element process with State HCD is cumbersome and unrealistic. Reviewers don't understand cities and open market dynamics – believe housing planning can be done in a vacuum |
| Hillsborough | N/A | N/A | N/A | Yes | N/A | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Utilizing a regional approach toward addressing affordable housing. |

| | | | | | | |
|---------------------|----|-------------|----|-----|-----------|--|
| South San Francisco | No | No – maybe? | No | Yes | Yes – 80% | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • More State/Federal resources/ open year round applications • Ability to combine funding sources • 1 for 1 production credit outside project area • Productivity credit for acquisition/rehab with restrictive covenants • Production credit 1 for 1 for group homes and single room occupancy hotel rooms • Production credit for shelter beds and transitional housing |
| San Mateo | No | No | No | Yes | No | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provide a greater share of property tax for affordable housing. Enough to support the development over time. |